

1 Katherine J. Ellena (SBN 324160)
2 kellen@reedsmith.com
3 REED SMITH LLP
4 515 South Flower Street, Suite 4300
5 Los Angeles, CA 90071-1514
6 Telephone: +1 213 457 8000
7 Facsimile: +1 213 457 8080

8 Michael B. Galibois (*pro hac vice*)
9 mgalibois@reedsmith.com
10 Emily Graue (*pro hac vice*)
11 egraue@reedsmith.com
12 Reed Smith LLP
13 10 South Wacker Drive, 40th Floor
14 Chicago, IL 60606-7507
15 Telephone: +1 312.207 1000
16 Facsimile: +1 312.207 6400

17 *Attorneys for Defendant,*
18 Rokoko Electronics, *et al.*

19 MATTHEW R. WALSH

20 Plaintiff,

21 vs.

22 ROKOKO ELECTRONICS, and
23 DOES 1 through 50, inclusive,

24 Defendant.

25 Case No.: 2:25-cv-05340-ODW-RAO

26 [Assigned to Hon. Otis D. Wright, II,
27 Courtroom 5D; Hon. Rozella A. Oliver,
28 Courtroom 590]

**DEFENDANT ROKOKO
ELECTRONICS' OPPOSITION TO
PLAINTIFF MATTHEW R.
WALSH'S MOTION TO EXTEND
PAGE LIMITATIONS FOR
MOTION FOR SUMMARY
JUDGMENT**

29 Date: December 22, 2025
30 Time: 1:30 p.m.
31 Place: Dept. 590

32 State Court Action Filed: May 12, 2025
33 Removal Date: June 12, 2025
34 Trial Date: None

35 DEFENDANT ROKOKO ELECTRONICS' OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFF MATTHEW R.
36 WALSH'S MOTION TO EXTEND PAGE LIMITATIONS FOR MOTION FOR SUMMARY
37 JUDGMENT

MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITY

I. INTRODUCTION

Plaintiff Matthew R. Walsh’s (“Plaintiff”) Motion to Extend Page Limitations for Motion for Summary Judgment (“Motion”) against Defendant Rokoko Electronics (“Rokoko”) improperly seeks leave to file an oversized brief in support of a “forthcoming” motion for summary judgment. Plaintiff has not met and conferred with Rokoko pursuant to L.R. 7-3, nor has he demonstrated exceptional circumstances warranting a summary judgment motion more than double the length permitted under L.R. 11-6. Plaintiffs Motion must be denied.

II. ARGUMENT

Plaintiff has not met and conferred with Plaintiffs pursuant to L.R. 7-3, and thus his Motion is procedurally deficient. Plaintiff asked if Rokoko would be willing to stipulate to a page limit extension on November 25, 2025, but Plaintiff never offered to meet and confer prior to filing his Motion. (Declaration of Katherine J. Ellena, Ex. A). Plaintiff then asked Rokoko to disregard his request to stipulate before Rokoko responded and proceeded to file his Motion without a meet and confer. (*Id.*)

Furthermore, Plaintiff's Motion is unwarranted insofar as it requests an “approximately 61 page motion to be filed” – more than double the typical 25-page summary judgment brief permitted under L.R. 11-6. “Given the district court's inherent power to control their dockets, whether to grant leave to exceed the page limits set forth in the [Local Rules] appears to be at the full discretion of the Court.” *Traylor Bros., Inc. v. San Diego Unified Port Dist.*, 2012 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 40977, *6; *see also Swanson v. U.S. Forest Serv.*, 87 F.3d 339, 345 (9th Cir. 1996) (courts have discretion to strike oversized briefs). Plaintiff does not demonstrate exceptional need or good cause as to why his arguments cannot be presented within the standard limit through editing or consolidation. Plaintiff's bare contentions that

he cannot adequately present the issues in fewer than 61-pages is not a grounds to grant an extension. This Court should therefore exercise its discretion and deny Plaintiff's Motion.

III. CONCLUSION

For all of the reasons explained herein, Rokoko respectfully requests this Court deny Plaintiff's Motion.

DATED: December 1, 2025

REED SMITH LLP

By: /s/ Katherine J. Ellena
Katherine J. Ellena
Michael Galibois (*pro hac vice*)
Emily Graue (*pro hac vice*)

*Attorneys for Defendant
Rokoko Electronics*

CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE

The undersigned, counsel of record for Defendant Rokoko Electronics, certifies that this Memorandum of Points and Authorities contains 342 words, which complies with the word limit of L.R. 11-6.2.

DATED: December 1, 2025

/s/ Katherine J. Ellena
Katherine J. Ellena